DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 062 PS 009 001

AUTHOR	Martin, Eugene Frederick
TITLE	Establish and Maintain a Child Service Demonstration Center for Children with Learning Disabilities. Fourth Quarterly and Final Progress Report to Health, Education, and Welfare.
INSTITUTION	Mississippi State Univ., Mississippi State. Child Service Demonstration Center for Children with Learning Disabilities.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	15 Jul 76
CONTRACT	OEC-300-74-9234
NOTE	40p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Budgets; Diagnostic Tests; *Early Childhood Education; *Educational Diagnosis; Educational Objectives; *Elementary Education; *Learning Disabilities; Parent Attitudes; Program Development; *Program Evaluation; Remedial Programs; *Teacher Education; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	Mississippi State University

ABSTRACT

This is the final report of a project set up to: (1) design and implement a multidisciplinary model of a diagnostic/prescriptive remedial demonstration center for training professional personnel who work with children experiencing specific learning disabilities and to (2) develop effective diagnostic/prescriptive/remedial procedures which will be transferable regionally and nationally. Included are short sections on the strategies employed to bring about project goals. More than two thirds of the report consist of appendices, including a summary of activities: formal and informal diagnostic tests, summaries of program evaluations by parents, school teachers, case coordinators, and trainees, and the summary of the evaluation of program goals. (MS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED133062

PS 009001

FOURTH QUARTERLY AND FINAL PROGRESS REPORT
to
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

on

Contract No. OEC-300-74-9234
Establish and Maintain a Child
Service Demonstration Center for Children
With Learning Disabilities

by

Eugene Frederick Martin, Project Director
Mississippi State University
Mississippi State, Mississippi 39762

15 July 1976

CHILD SERVICE
DEMONSTRATION CENTER
FOR CHILDREN WITH
LEARNING DISABILITIES

Mississippi State University
Mississippi State, Mississippi 39762

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	2
III.	PROGRAM FUNDING SUMMARY	7
IV.	BUDGET SUMMARY	8
V.	APPENDIX I Summary of Activities	9
VI.	APPENDIX II Formal Diagnostic Tests	10
VII.	APPENDIX III Informal Diagnostic Tests	12
VIII.	APPENDIX IV IRA Program Outline	13
IX.	APPENDIX V Summary of Parents' Evaluations	14
X.	APPENDIX VI Summary of Schools' Evaluations	17
XI.	APPENDIX VII Summary of Case Coordinators' Evaluations	20
XII.	APPENDIX VIII Summary of Trainees' Evaluations	23
XIII.	APPENDIX IX Summary of Program Goals' Evaluation	27

I

INTRODUCTION

The second year of operation of the Child Service Demonstration Center at Mississippi State University is designed to maintain and develop the capacities of the facility, including the extension of its services to the entire State of Mississippi.

During the fourth quarter of this funding period 17 graduate students are receiving supervised training at the facility, 206 undergraduate and graduate students have thus far utilized the Center's facilities as part of related course-work, 31 professional and concerned persons have visited the Center, 4 children have received diagnostic/prescriptive services, 42 children are receiving diagnostic/prescriptive/remedial services. (See Appendix I for Summary of Activities). All but back-ordered videotape equipment has been received. Internal and external evaluation of the Center has been accomplished. The Technical Manual is in press. A newsletter describing the Center's progress has been sent to each member of the Advisory Council.

II

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

The goals of the project are:

1. To design and implement a multidisciplinary model of a diagnostic/prescriptive remedial demonstration center for training professional personnel who work with children experiencing specific learning disabilities...
2. to provide the development of effective diagnostic/prescriptive/remedial procedures that will be applicable and transferable regionally and nationally (p. 24, Section I, Original Proposal). The specific strategies and activities employed to reach these goals follow.

I. Strategy

To establish an environment that allows the appropriate supervision of trainees while exposed to a comprehensive range of specific learning disabled children (p. 22, Section I, Original Proposal).

A. Activities

1. The Mississippi State University facility will be remodeled to meet the needs of the proposed ... (p. 23, Section I, Original Proposal).
   a. Physical Plant, Mississippi State University, completed painting the exterior of the structure in May, 1976.
2. ...One of the rooms will be equipped with videotaping equipment to aid in the training of pre-and in-service personnel (p. 23, Section I, Original Proposal).
   a. All but two back-ordered videotape receivers have been delivered and installed.

II. Strategy

To give all trainees supervised practicum experiences in multidisciplinary staffings (p. 25, Section I, Original Proposal).

A. Activities

1. Each child referred to the Center will be educationally and psychologically evaluated by a team of 5 to 8 members, representing the different disciplines (p. 25, Section I, Original Proposal).

   a. The six graduate students enrolled in the course, Practicum: Diagnosis of Children with Learning Disabilities, during the summer semester, 1976, represent the areas of Educational Psychology, Special Education, and Elementary Education.

II. Strategy

To give each trainee supervised experiences in the administration, scoring, and interpretation of a wide variety of formal diagnostic instruments (p. 25, Section I, Original Proposal).

A. Activities

1. Each trainee will administer 1) physical screening instruments, 2) visual-motor tests, 3) standardized group achievement tests, 4) standardized individual achievement tests, 5) individualized psychological tests, 6) standardized subject matter tests in a continuously supervised setting (pp. 25-26, Section I, Original Proposal).

   a. Appendix II includes a list of the formal diagnostic instruments administered, scored, and interpreted by the diagnostic teams thus far in their training.

IV. Strategy

To give each trainee supervised experiences in the administration, scoring, and interpretation of a wide variety of informal diagnostic instruments. (p. 26, Section I, Original Proposal).

A. Activities

1. Each trainee will administer 1) conceptual sorting tests, 2) informal social-emotional inventories, 3) informal achievement tests, 4) interest and attitude scales (p. 26, Section I, Original Proposal).

a. Appendix III includes a list of the informal diagnostic instruments administered, scored, and interpreted by the diagnostic team thus far in their training.

V. Strategy

To provide each trainee with experiences leading to the formulation of prescriptive/remedial objectives that are appropriate for the individual strengths, weaknesses, and needs of each child evaluated at the Center (p. 28, Section I, Original Proposal).

A. Activities

1. Each trainee will be required to preview and evaluate the wide variety of commercially prepared remedial materials for the individual needs of his case (p. 28, Section I, Original Proposal).

   a. An aim of the Center's diagnostic/prescriptive phase is to made prescriptions as practical as possible for schools. A section of school background information forms deals with the materials available within the referring school facility. The trainees are required to preview and evaluate these materials so that they can better plan usable prescriptions.

2. Each trainee will be required to demonstrate the correct use of a wide variety of commercially prepared remedial materials appropriate for the individual needs of his case (p. 28, Original Proposal).

   a. Each trainee enrolled in the course, Practicum: Remediation of Learning Disabilities, is required to preview appropriate commercial materials to be used in his/her tutoring sessions. The use of these materials is videotaped during tutoring sessions and the trainee's effectiveness with them is evaluated by self and staff critique.

3. Each trainee will be required to develop teacher-made materials to meet the individual needs of his case if appropriate materials are not available

commercially (p. 28, Original Proposal).

Approximately 60 per cent of the material used in the tutoring sessions is teacher-made.

VI. Strategy

To provide dissemination of successful diagnostic/prescriptive/remedial procedures to teachers, administrators, parents, and appropriate concerned personnel (p. 28, Section I, Original Proposal).

A. Activities

1. The Center staff will continue to represent the Child Service Demonstration Center at civic and professional meetings (p. 11, Section I, Second Year Proposal).

   a. The Center staff and four graduate assistants attended the Council for Exceptional Children conference in Chicago, Illinois, April 5-9, 1976.

   b. The Center staff attended the International Reading Association Conference in Anaheim, California, May 9-14, 1976. They spoke during a Symposium on "Mainstreaming the Exceptional Student in Reading ..." An outline of the program may be found in Appendix IV.

VII. Strategy

To evaluate the process and product of the Center's program.

A. Activities

The Center will record comments to behavioral rating scales by participating parents, referring schools, and trainees (p. 29, Section I, Original Proposal).

a. Rating scales were sent to parents, schools, case coordinators, and graduate trainees during the fall, 1975, to assess their evaluation of the services provided by the Center. Fifty per cent of the parents have responded; the summery of their evaluation may be found in Appendix V. Sixty seven per cent of the schools have responded; the summary of their

evaluations may be found in Appendix VI. Appendix VII includes a summary of the fifty per cent response from the case coordinators. One hundred per cent of the graduate trainees have responded; a summary of their evaluations may be found in Appendix VIII.

b. Two representatives from American Institutes for Research (AIR) visited the Center June 14-18, 1976. They reviewed student records, interviewed the Center staff, and met with the following University personnel: Dr. J. Chester McKee, Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School; Mr. Abner Harrison, Office of Research and Graduate Studies; Dr. Merrill M. Hawkins, Dean of the College of Education; Dr. James E. Wall, Associate Dean of the College of Education; and Dr. James R. Wilson, Department Head of Educational Psychology/Special Education.

c. The success with which the Center met its goals and objectives during its two years of BEH funding is summarized in Appendix IX.

VIII. Strategy

...a technical manual will be written and made available to systems wanting to replicate the Center by the end of the second year of the program (p. 15, Section I, Original Proposal).

A. Activity

1. The Technical Manual is in press at Central Duplicating, Mississippi State University, and should be ready for distribution by July 31, 1976. Copies will be sent to BEH and other appropriate sources as soon as they are available.

III

PROGRAM FUNDING SUMMARY

During the Fourth Quarter of Fiscal Year, 1976, $21,246.04, has been spent leaving a balance of $000.00.

IV

BUDGET SUMMARY *
Fiscal Year 1976

Contract # OEC-300-74-9234

Fourth Quarter
April 1, 1976-June 30, 1976

FEDERAL SUPPORT

Line Item	Allocated	Balance
Personnel Salary	29,307.00	0
Employee Benefits	2,044.00	0
Staff Travel	4,300.00**	0
Consultants & Workshop	3,000.00	0
Project Evaluation	1,500.00	0
Project Dissemination	3,000.00	0
Communications	1,500.00	0
Physical Facilities	600.00**	0
Specialized Equipment	9,175.00	0
Specialized Materials	9,594.00	0
Subtotal	64,020.00	0
Overhead	5,122.00	0
TOTAL	69,142.00	0

*This budget summary is only an estimate. The final financial report will be filed by the Comptroller's Office, Mississippi State University when all accounts have been paid.

**Transfer of $1,800.00 approved 1/29/76, (Judy Fein) from Physical Facilities to Staff Travel.

CHILD SERVICE DEMONSTRATION CENTER
Summary of Activities

APPENDIX I

CHILDREN RECEIVING SERVICES	4/1/76 to 6/30/76	7/1/76 to 6/30/76	GRAND TOTAL 1/15/75 to 3/31/76
Children referred for diagnostic/prescriptive services	8	68	137
Children receiving diagnostic/prescriptive evaluation	4	22	38
Children referred for diagnostic/prescriptive/ remedial services (Summer, 1976)	48	74	117
Children receiving diagnostic/prescriptive/ remedial services	42	74	74
TOTAL CHILDREN SERVED	46	96	112
VISITORS			
Students utilizing facility as part of of related course-work	206	947	1553
Parents	11	50	116
Professional Personnel	31	167	355
GRADUATE TRAINEES			
Total number of graduate students receiving supervised training	17	128	156

APPENDIX II

FORMAL DIAGNOSTIC TESTS

Beltone Audiometer

Keystone Telebinocular

Woodcock Reading Mastery Test

KeyMath Diagnostic Arithmetic Test

Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test

Draw-A-Man

Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC-R)

Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA)

Diagnostic Reading Scales (Spache)

Goldman-Fristoe Test of Auditory Discrimination

Wide Range Achievement Test

Benton Test of Visual Retention

Peabody Individual Achievement Test

Utah Test of Language Development

Metropolitan Readiness Tests

Cognitive Skills Assessment Battery

Beery Developmental Test of Visual-Motor Integration

Stanford Binet

Boehm Test of Basic Concepts

Lincoln Oseretsky Test of Motor Proficiency

Assessment of Children's Language Comprehension

California Achievement Test

Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Test of Articulation

Children's Aperception Test

Winter-Haven Perceptual Test

Bender-Gestalt

Wepman Test of Auditory Discrimination

Frostig Test of Visual Perception

Rorshach

Gray Oral Reading Test

Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty

Slosson Oral Reading Test (SORT)

Slosson Intelligence Test (SIT)

Basic Educational Skills Inventory (BESI)-Math

Basic Educational Skills Inventory (BESI)-Reading

Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence (WPPSI)

Animal Crackers

Stanford Achievement Test

Select-Ed Target-Behavior

APPENDIX III

INFORMAL DIAGNOSTIC INSTRUMENTS

Silvaroli Sight Word Test

Betts Spelling Inventory

Incomplete Sentences

Subjective Reading Inventory

Van Wagenen Word Learning Subtest

Inventory of Interests and Attitudes

Parent Interviews

Child Interviews

Mini-teaching Sessions

Bett's Test of Visual Discrimination

Dolch Word List

APPENDIX IV

IRA PROGRAM OUTLINE

Wednesday, May 12—2:00-4:45 p.m. **SYMPOSIA**

ROYAL INN, STATE

Integrating Reading Instruction into Earth Science: The Development of a Competency-Based Instructional System Intended for reading specialists, classroom teachers, and administrators, grades 9-12. *Chairing:* to be announced

Information Processing in Earth Science: A Reading Specialist Discusses the Reading/Thinking Competencies Needed in Earth Science, and the Design of an Instructional System to Develop Them *Speaker:* Ruth T. Keimig, Fairfax County, Virginia Public Schools

Implementing Competency-Based Reading Instruction in Earth Science Classes: A Science Teacher Discusses Instructional Strategies and Classroom Management *Speaker:* William K. Johnson, Fairfax County, Virginia Public Schools

Possibilities, Problems, and Practicality: An Administrator's Role in Instructional System Design *Speaker:* Rennie C. Coleman, Jr., Fairfax County, Virginia Public Schools

QUALITY INN, ORANGEWOOD 1

Mainstreaming the Exceptional Student in Reading: Strategies for Teaching the Mentally Retarded, Learning/Behavioral Disorders and Gifted in the Regular Classroom Intended for classroom teachers, reading supervisors, and teacher trainers, grades K-12. *Chairing:* Frances A. Karnes, University of Southern Mississippi

Strategies to Functionalize Reading for the Mentally Retarded *Speaker:* Nancy Wallner, Mississippi State University

Effective Teaching Techniques for the Learning/Behavioral Disorder Students *Speaker:* Eugene F. Martin, Mississippi State University

Personalizing the Reading Program for the Gifted *Speaker:* Frances A. Karnes, University of Southern Mississippi

Audience Question and Answer Session

Summary *Speaker:* Frances A. Karnes, University of Southern Mississippi

QUALITY INN, ORANGEWOOD 3

Teaching College-Level Reading in a Computer Assisted/Computer Managed Setting Intended for college and junior college instructors of reading, English, and study skills, and others interested in computer assisted/managed instruction at all levels. *Chairing:* Wayne R. Herlin, Brigham Young University

Applying an Instructional Psychology Model to Analysis of the Reading Task *Speaker:* Barbara Vance, Brigham Young University

Using a Time-Shared, Interactive, Computer-Controlled Instructional Television (TICCIT) System to Teach Reading at the College Level *Speaker:* Dorothy M. Hansen, Brigham Young University

TICCIT-Based Reading Instruction to Beginning Freshmen Students at a Large, Four-Year University: A Critique Based on Preliminary Data *Panelists:* V. Con Osborne, Brigham Young University; Craig K. Mayfield, Brigham Young University

Question and Answer Period, Audience to all Participants

Summary *Speaker:* Wayne R. Herlin, Brigham Young University

HYATT HOUSE, VALENCIA

Readers Theatre: A New Approach to Old Problems Intended for classroom teachers and all others interested in the dynamics of an innovative oral approach to literature, grades K-12. *Chairing:* Mary Stuart Taylor, La Mesa, California Schools

Introduction: E. Kingsley Povenmire, San Diego State University **Audience Participation In:** "The Lion Hunt"

Readers Theatre Performances by Elementary, Secondary, and University Students *Director:* William J. Adams, San Diego State University

Discussion: Getting Started in Readers Theatre *Speakers:* Mary Stuart Taylor, La Mesa, California Schools; William Franklin Smith, San Diego, California Schools

Practicum: Audience Participating with Readers Theatre The Institute for Readers Theatre Members

APPENDIX V

SUMMARY OF PARENTS' EVALUATIONS

EVALUATION OF SERVICES
To The Home

CHILD SERVICE DEMONSTRATION CENTER
Mississippi State University

Parent(s) of _____: Please complete the following form and return it to the Child Service Demonstration Center. A stamped, self-addressed envelope has been enclosed for your convenience.

(Please check your response)	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
1. Written communication with the Center was given prompt attention.	100%		
2. I (We) felt free to call upon the Center staff for information and/or consultation.	100%		
3. The information requested on the referral forms was easily obtainable.	100%		
4. The Handbook for Parents and Case Coordinators was clearly written.	100%		
5. The Handbook for Parents and Case Coordinators was helpful.	100%		
6. The Case Coordinator explained the "Diagnostic Summary" to me (us).	100%		
7. I (We) now have a better understanding of the child's strengths and weaknesses.	100%		
8. The Case Coordinator explained the "Recommendations to the Home" to me (us).	100%		
9. The recommendations made to the home were feasible in terms of the family structure and life style.	100%		
10. The recommendations made to the home seemed appropriate for the child.	100%		
11. The recommendations made to the home were easily implemented.	100%		

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
12. I (We) noted changes in the child's behavior and/or attitudes at home.	100%		
13. I (We) feel the child should probably receive tutorial help during the summer.	25%		75%
14. I (We) would like to have the child reevaluated at the Center during the next school year.	75%		75%
15. I (We) feel the child's progress is	poor	25% satisfactory	75% good

Problems encountered:

Comments:

Signature _____

Date _____

APPENDIX VI

SUMMARY OF SCHOOLS' EVALUATIONS

EVALUATION OF SERVICES
To The School

CHILD SERVICE DEMONSTRATION CENTER
Mississippi State University

Teacher(s) of _____: Please complete the following form and return it to the Child Service Demonstration Center. A stamped, self-addressed envelope has been enclosed for your convenience.

(Please check your response)	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
1. Written communication with the Center was given prompt attention.	75%		25%
2. I (We) felt free to call upon the Center staff for information and/or consultation.	75%		25%
3. The information requested on the referral forms was easily obtainable.	75%		25%
4. The Handbook for Parents and Case Coordinators was clearly written.	100%		
5. The Handbook for Parents and Case Coordinators was helpful.	100%		
6. The Case Coordinator explained the "Diagnostic Summary" to me (us).	50%	50%	
7. I (We) now have a better understanding of the child's strengths and weaknesses.	75%		25%
8. The Case Coordinator explained the "Recommendations to the School" to me (us)	50%	50%	
9. The recommendations made to the school were feasible in terms of the school's structure and teaching capabilities	100%		
10. The recommendations made to the school seemed appropriate for the child.	75%		25%
11. The recommendations made to the school were easily implemented.	100%		

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
12. I (We) noted changes in the child's behavior and/or attitudes at school.	75%		25%
13. I (We) feel the child should probably receive tutorial help during the summer.	25%	50%	25%
14. I (We) would like to have the child reevaluated at the Center during the next school year.	25%	50%	25%
15. I (We) feel the child's progress has been	poor	satisfactory (100%)	good

Problems encountered:

Comments:

Signature _____

Date _____

APPENDIX VII

SUMMARY OF CASE COORDINATORS' EVALUATIONS

EVALUATION OF SERVICES
To Case Coordinator

CHILD SERVICE DEMONSTRATION CENTER
Mississippi State University

Case Coordinator for _____: Please complete the following form and return it to the Child Service Demonstration Center. A stamped, self-addressed envelope has been enclosed for your convenience.

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
1. Written communication with the Center was given prompt attention.	100%		
2. I felt free to call upon the Center staff for information and/or consultation.	100%		
3. The information requested on the referral forms was easily obtainable from the records.	100%		
4. The Handbook for Parents and Case Coordinators was clearly written.	100%		
5. The Handbook for Parents and Case Coordinators was helpful.	100%		
6. The "Diagnostic Summary" was easily understandable.	100%		
7. The "Diagnostic Summary" was sufficiently detailed to be helpful.	100%		
8. The recommendations made to the school were feasible in terms of the school's organization, materials, and staff capabilities.	100%		
9. The recommendations made to the school seemed appropriate for the child.	100%		
10. The recommendations made to the school were easily implemented.			100%
11. The child should probably receive tutorial help during the summer.			100%

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
12. The child should probable be reevaluated at the Center during the next school year.		100%	
13. The child's progress since evaluation has been	poor	satisfactory	good 100%

Problems encountered:

Comments:

Signature _____

Date _____

APPENDIX VIII

SUMMARY OF TRAINEES' EVALUATIONS

EVALUATION OF TRAINING

CHILD SERVICE DEMONSTRATION CENTER
Mississippi State University

Student completing Training: Please complete the following form and return it to the Child Service Demonstration Center. A stamped self-addressed envelope has been included for your convenience.

(Please check one of the following)	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
1. Adequate orientation to the Center was provided	100%		
2. The objectives of the training experiences were clearly explained.	100%		
3. Adequate instruction in test administration was given.	100%		
4. Adequate instruction in test interpretation was given.	100%		
5. I profitted from the multidisciplinary staffings.	100%		
6. The size of the staffings was satisfactory.	100%		
7. The supervision of testing and/or remediation was satisfactory.	100%		
8. The staff supervisors were readily available to provide assistance to me.	100%		
9. The Graduate Assistants were readily available to provide assistance to me.	100%		
10. I feel confident doing psychoeducational testing.	100%		
11. I feel confident making psychoeducational diagnosis.	50%	50%	

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
12. I feel confident making educational prescriptions.	50%	50%	
13. I feel confident matching materials and methods to individual needs.	100%		
14. I feel confident writing a case study.	100%		
15. Testing and teaching materials were in adequate supply.	100%		
16. The video-tape experiences were helpful.	100%		
17. I feel confident interviewing parents.	100%		
18. I feel confident interpreting a Diagnostic Summary and recommendations to school officials.	100%		
19. I would rate this training experience as	50% E	50% G	S P

20. Strengths of the training program:

21. Weaknesses of the training program:

22. Problems encountered during training:

23. Suggestions for change of training:

Signature _____

Date _____

Please complete the following so that our permanent records will be accurate for communication with you and for a research data bank.

Name: Mr. Miss Mrs. Dr. _____

Permanent Mailing Address: _____
(Where mail can always reach you or be forwarded to you) _____

Date of Graduation: _____

Degree: _____

Major Area of Study: _____

Major Advisor: _____

Current Job Title: _____

Current Job Description: _____
(Please be specific)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for taking the time to complete this evaluation of training. Only by your participation can training programs be strengthened.

APPENDIX IX

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM GOALS' EVALUATION

	MET	NOT MET
THE PROGRAM		
I. Goal		
To design and implement a multidisciplinary model of a diagnostic/prescriptive/remedial demonstration center for training professional personnel who work with children experiencing specific learning disabilities by providing during each calendar year:	X	
• nine months of diagnostic/prescriptive experiences for pre-service personnel and	X	
• nine weeks of diagnostic/prescriptive/remedial experiences for in-service personnel.	X	
A. Objective		
To provide a simulation environment and experience for training pre-service personnel to use diagnostic/prescriptive techniques for children experiencing specific learning disabilities.	X	
B. Objective		
To provide a simulation environment and experience for training in-service personnel to use diagnostic/prescriptive/remedial techniques for children experiencing specific learning disabilities.	X	
C. Objective		
To establish an educational service for teachers, parents, school administrators, and other personnel concerning diagnostic/prescriptive/remedial procedures for children experiencing specific learning disabilities.	X	
1. Strategy		
To establish a multidisciplinary team approach for the diagnostic/prescriptive/remedial approach to provide services for children experiencing specific learning disabilities.	X	
a. Activities		
(1). Appropriate staff personnel will be identified and recruited from a number of disciplines (i.e., Special Education, Reading, Psychology, Guidance and Counseling, and Medicine, among others). Tentative commitments have been secured from selected Mississippi State University personnel (Appendix D).	X	
(2). Physical facilities will be provided by Mississippi State University that will permit the program to be realized (Appendix D).	X	

	MET	NOT MET
(3). Mississippi State University will make the necessary modification in college curricula for undergraduate and graduate students in training (also Appendix C).	X	
(4). Supervisory responsibilities, time and space utilization, methodology, data collection, and program evaluation will be effected by the proposed center's staff.	X	
(5). Recruitment of pre-service trainees from Psychology, Reading, Special Education, Guidance and Counseling will be effected as part of their undergraduate course work.	X	
(6). Recruitment of existing concerned personnel will be effected through Mississippi State University's summer school program. School systems within the state of Mississippi, summer school students, and other concerned personnel will be made aware of the training experiences. Students wishing to participate in the program will have the experiences made part of their graduate program course work.	X	
(7). Recruitment of potential specific learning disabled children to participate in the pre-service aspect of the program will be accomplished through mass media, school bulletins, and personal contact (approximately 25-50 children per regular nine month college year).	X	
(a). Specific teacher referrals will be utilized from the state's school system.	X	
(b). Specific non-educational referrals will be utilized.	X	
(c). Parental referrals will be accepted from coordinating personnel.	X	
(d). All participants must have full, written parental or guardian consent	X	
(8). Recruitment of potential specific learning disabled children to participate in the in-service aspect of the program will be	X	

	MET	NOT MET
accomplished in the same manner (approximately 30-100 children per regular nine week college summer session).		
2. Strategy		
To establish an environment that allows the appropriate supervision of trainees while exposed to a comprehensive range of specific learning disabled children.	X	
a. Activities		
(1). Mississippi State University will make necessary curricula changes in the course offerings to undergraduate and graduate students.	X	
(a). Undergraduate and graduate observations will be made a part of selected course work.	X	
(b). Graduate practicum experience in psychology, reading, guidance, and/or special education will be available in this proposed center.	X	
(2). Appropriate commercial remedial material which is currently not available in the College of Education's Material Center will be secured.	X	
(3). Appropriate remedial techniques and materials will be developed when needed and applicable.	X	
3. Strategy		
To provide an educational service to parents, regular classroom teachers, school administrators, and other concerned personnel that are personally involved with diagnostic/prescriptive/remedial procedures utilized with children experiencing specific learning disabilities.	X	
II. Goal		
To provide the development of effective diagnostic/prescriptive/remedial procedures that will be applicalbe and transferable regionally and nationally.	X	
A. Objective		
To develop effective diagnostic/prescriptive/remedial procedures and materials for children experiencing specific learning disabilities.	X	

	MET	NOT MET
B. Objective		
To develop mechanisms by which successful diagnostic/prescriptive remedial strategies can be effectively disseminated throughout the region and the nation.	X	
C. Objective		
To develop mechanisms by which short term and long term follow-up evaluations of individual children can be effected.	X	
1. Strategy		
To give all trainees supervised practicum experiences in multidisciplinary staffings.	X	
a. Activities		
(1). Each child referred to the center will be educationally evaluated by a team of 5 to 8 members, representing the different disciplines.	X	
(2). Each child referred to the center will be psychologically evaluated by a team of 5 to 8 members, representing the different disciplines.	X	
(3). Appropriate medical personnel will be involved in the case study staffings if the needs of the individual children warrant such a procedure.	X	
2. Strategy		
To give each trainee supervised practicum experiences in the administration, scoring, and interpretation of a wide variety of formal diagnostic instruments.	X	
a. Activities		
(1). Each trainee will administer 1) physical screening instruments such as the Keystone-Telebinocular and the Beltone Audiometer, 2) visual-motor tests such as the Beery Developmental Test of Visual Motor Integration and the Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception, 3) standardized group achievement tests, 4) standardized individual achievement such as the Wide Range Achievement Test and the Peabody Individual Achievement Test, 5) individualized psychological tests as the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, the Stanford Binet, the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities, and the Bender-Gestalt, 6) standardized subject matter tests such as the Gray Oral Reading Test, the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test and KeyMath Diagnostic Arithmetic Test	X	

	MET	NOT MET
in a continuously supervised setting. The accuracy of test scoring and the interpretation of the results will be evaluated by the trainees and the supervisory staff in the case staffing of each child.		
3. Strategy		
To give each trainee supervised practicum experiences in the administration, scoring, and interpretation of a wide variety of informal diagnostic instruments.	X	
a. Activities		
(1). Each trainee will administer 1) conceptual sorting tests, 2) informal social-emotional inventories, 3) informal achievement tests such as a Subjective Reading Inventory, the Betts Spelling Test, the Silvaroli Sight Word Test, and the Wepman Test of Auditory Discrimination, 4) interest and attitude scales in a continuously supervised setting. The accuracy of test scoring and the interpretation of the results will be evaluated by the trainees and the supervisory staff in the case staffing of each child.	X	
(2). Each trainee will be expected to participate in mini-teaching sessions used for possible prescriptive units. Such sessions will include language experience, i/t/a, and Fernald approaches to remediation.	X	
4. Strategy		
To provide trainees with the opportunities to acquire interviewing techniques with parents, classroom teachers, and other personnel concerned with children experiencing specific learning disabilities.	X	
a. Activities		
(1). Following intensive and extensive instruction with interviewing techniques, the parents of each child referred to the proposed center will be interviewed separately by the trainee responsible for the case The interviews will be audio taped for evaluation. and critique by the trainee and the supervisory staff.	X	
(2). When possible the teacher of each child referred to the proposed center will be interviewed by the trainee responsible for the case. Evaluation of the interview will be made during private conference of the trainee and the supervisory staff. The results of the interview will be disseminated to the entire case team during the case staffing.	X	

	MET	NOT MET
(3). When possible the trainee responsible for the case will deliver the completed case study to the referring personnel. Reaction to the case study will be obtained by interview techniques. This feedback will be utilized in evalution of the program.	X	
5. Strategy		
To provide each trainee with experiences leading to the formulation of prescriptive/remedial objectives that are appropriate for the individual strengths, weaknesses, and needs of each child evaluated at the proposed center.	X	
a. Activities		
(1). Each trainee will be required to preview and evaluate the wide variety of commercially prepared remedial materials appropriate for the indiviual needs of his case.	X	
(2). Each trainee will be required to demonstrate the correct use of the wide variety of commercially prepared remedial materials appropriate for the individual needs of his case.	X	
(3). Each trainee will be required to develop teacher-made materials to meet the individual needs of his case if appropriate materials are not available commercially.	X	
(4). The program of training during the diagnostic/prescriptive/remedial period (summer, 1976) will be expanded to provide greater flexibility and experiences in the development of teacher competency. Instead of employing only one-to-one and small group remedial tutoring, the trainees will learn how to utilize peer teaching techniques.	X	
6. Strategy		
To provide dissemination of successful diagnostic/prescriptive/remedial procedures to teachers, administrators, parents, and appropriate concerned personnel.	X	
a. Activities		
(1). The staff of the center will author an informative booklet for parents of children experiencing specific learning disabilities. County libraries and physicians in the area will be contacted as possible distribution sources for the booklet. Announcements of availability will be made through	X	

	MET	NOT MET
mass media. Copies of the booklet will also be mailed from the center upon request.		
(2). The staff of the center will author a booklet for public schools, providing information and program suggestions about and for children suspected of experiencing specific learning disabilities. Notification of the availability of the booklet will be sent to public school systems; the booklets will be mailed to requesting personnel.	X	
(3). The Mississippi State University Center will co-host the Mississippi Association for Children with Learning Disabilities (MACLD) meeting in February, 1976.	X	
(4). The Center staff will author a Technical Manual sufficiently detailed so that the program can be replicated regionally and/or nationally.	X	
(5). The Center staff will broaden its production of audio/video teaching tapes and will continue to encourage other departments to utilize the video equipment, as well as the rest of the facilities at the Center.	X	
7. Strategy		
To evaluate the process and product of the proposed center program.	X	
a. Activities		
(1). Diagnosed children will be followed-up in the public schools by consultation and evaluation forms. The appropriateness of each prescriptive/remedial program will be reevaluated and modified, as warranted by the child's progress.	X	
(2). The center will record visiting professionals' comments and responses to the proposed center's programs.	X	
(3). The proposed center will record comments and responses to behavioral rating scales by participating parents, interested personnel, and visiting professionals.	X	
(4). Descriptive research data about the population being served will continue to be gathered and alalyzed for future reporting.	X	

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

FORM APPROVED
OMB NO. 51-R1091

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE REPORT *(Discretionary Grants)*

Part I

All grantees with awards from programs listed under "General Instructions" above respond.

1. Date of Report:	2. Grant Number:
September 25, 1976	OEC-300-74-9234
3. Period of Report: From:	**To:**
July 1, 1974	June 30, 1976

4. Grantee Name and Descriptive Name of Project: Mississippi State University

"Establish and Maintain A Child Service Demonstration Center For Children With Learning Disabilities "

Certification: I certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief this report *(consisting of this and subsequent pages and attachments)* is correct and complete in all respects, except as may be specifically noted herein.

Typed Name of Project Director(s) or Principal Investigator(s):	Signature of Project Director(s) or Principal Investigator(s):
Eugene F. W. Martin	E. F. W. Martin

Part II *("Accomplishment" Reporting)*

A. All grantees, except for those with awards under 13.443 and 13.447 are to respond to this Section A. Grantees under 13.443 and 13.447 go to B of Part II.

The grant application for programs 13.445, 13.446, 13.450, and 13.520 provided for the following functions or activities as categorical headings in the budget and narrative sections:

Research and Development
Demonstration/Service
Evaluation
Dissemination
"Inservice" Training

Programs 13.448, 13.451, and 13.452 do not usually require a breakout since the primary function or activity is intrinsic to the respective program.

For each of the above programs, functions, or activities *(as well as those of special import for certain programs; e.g., replication, advisory councils, parent involvement)* discuss the objectives and subobjectives presented in the approved application *(in narrative format)* in terms of:

(a) Accomplishments and milestones met.
(b) Slippages in attainment and reasons for the slippages.

Refer back to your application and utilize your quantitative quarterly projections, scheduled chronological order and target dates, and data collected and maintained as well as criteria and methodologies used to evaluate results for (a) and (b).

Also highlight those phases of the plans of action presented in your application that proved most successful, as well as those that upon implementation did not appear fruitful.

Grantees finishing this portion of Part II, go to C of Part II.

B. Reporting for Grantees under 13.443 *(Research and Demonstration)* and 13.447 *(Physical Education and Recreation Research).*

Discuss major activities carried out, major departures from the original plan, problems encountered, significant preliminary findings, results, and a description and evaluation of any final product. Either include copies of, or discuss: information materials released; reports in newspapers, magazines, journals, etc.; papers prepared for professional meetings; textual and graphic materials; completed curriculum materials and instructional guides, or drafts if in a developmental stage, special methods, techniques and models developed; tests, scales and other measuring services used.

When finished with this portion of Part II, 13.443 and 13.447 grantees go to C of Part II.

C. All grantees are to respond to this Section C. Discuss the following:

(1) Unanticipated or anticipated spinoff developments *(i.e., those which were not part of your originally approved subobjectives, but which are contemplated within the purpose of the Education for the Handicapped legislation, such as new cooperative interagency efforts, a decision by volunteer(s) to pursue a career in special education, new public school pol-*

(Part II, Section C, continued from reverse)

icy to integrate handicapped children into regular classrooms, enactment of mandatory or other State legislation affecting early education, relevant new course offerings at universities, etc.).

(2) Where outputs are quantified in response to any portion of Part II, relate quantifications to cost data for computation of unit costs. Analyze and explain high-cost units.

(3) Indicate other matters which you would like OE to know about *(e.g., community response to the project, matters concerning the project's working relationship with OE, technical assistance of OE staff, or any other relevant subject.)*

Part III

All grantees with a Demonstration/Service function or activity are to complete Table I. All grantees under 13.488 and 13.451, as well as those under other handicapped programs with a Training/"Inservice" Training activity are to complete Table II.

Table IA
Demonstration/Service Activities Data
Children

Enter actual performance data for this report period into the appropriate boxes. Use age as of the time of the original application, or the continuation application, whichever is later. On lines above line 11, count multihandicapped individuals only once, by primary handicapping condition, and indicate the number of multihandicapped in line 12. Data for lines 1 through 11 are for those directly served; i.e., services to those enrolled or receiving major services, and not those merely screened, referred or given minimal or occasional services.

Type of Handicap	Number of Handicapped Served by Age					
	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	Ages 6-9	Ages 10-12	Ages 13-18	Age 19 and Over
1. Trainable Mentally Retarded						
2. Educable Mentally Retarded						
3. Specific Learning Disabilities	0	10	56	35	11	0
4. Deaf-Blind						
5. Deaf/Hard of Hearing						
6. Visually Handicapped						
7. Seriously Emotionally Disturbed						
8. Speech Impaired						
9. Other Health Impaired						
10. Crippled						
11. Total						
12. Multihandicapped						

If the data in the above table differ by more than 10 percent from the data originally presented in your approved application, please explain the difference.

Table IB

Project Staff Providing Services to Recipients in Table IA

Type of Staff	Number	
	Full-time	Part-time *(As Full-time Equivalents)*
Professional Personnel *(excluding teachers)*	2	0
Teachers	0	0
Paraprofessional	0	0

Table IC

If applicable: Services to Those Handicapped Not Included in Table IA

Service	Number of Handicapped
Screened	
Diagnostic and Evaluative	
Found to Need Special Help	
Other Resource Assistance	

Table II

Preservice/Inservice Training Data

Handicapped Area of Primary Concentration	Number of Persons Received Inservice Training	Number of Students Received Preservice Training by Degree Sought			
		AA	BA	MA	Post-MA
Multihandicapped					
Administration					
Early Childhood					
Trainable Mentally Retarded					
Educable Mentally Retarded					
Specific Learning Disabilities	70	0	15	36	35
Deaf/Hard of Hearing					
Visually Handicapped					
Seriously Emotionally Disturbed					
Speech Impaired					
Crippled and Other Health Impaired					
TOTAL	70	0	15	36	35

If data in Table II above differ by more than 10 percent from those in your approved application, explain.